



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/816,152	03/26/2001	William A. Knaus	031672.0004	6441

25227 7590 06/17/2005
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
1650 TYSONS BOULEVARD
SUITE 300
MCLEAN, VA 22102

EXAMINER

NAJARIAN, LENA

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3626

DATE MAILED: 06/17/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/816,152	Applicant(s) KNAUS ET AL.	
	Examiner Lena Najarian	Art Unit 3626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 March 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL.
- 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-59 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-59 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 37 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☒ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
 - 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.



DETAILED ACTION

Oath/Declaration

1. The oath or declaration is defective. A new oath or declaration in compliance with 37 CFR 1.67(a) identifying this application by application number and filing date is required. See MPEP §§ 602.01 and 602.02.

The oath or declaration is defective because:
It does not identify the citizenship of each inventor.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 37 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. Applying the infringement test, what is needed to infringe claim 37 is, for example, an electronic database of medical records that if and when executed would cause a computer to do the obtaining, compiling, inputting, and allowing steps. However, such a database would not infringe the method steps of claim 30 since the database itself never performs any of the active steps of obtaining, compiling, inputting, and allowing required by the method. In other words, mere possession of such a database would infringe claim 37, but this is not enough to infringe claim 30. As a result, claim 37 is an improper dependent claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 9, 11, and 41-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

5. Claims 9, 11, and 41-45 recite the limitations for which there is no antecedent basis in the claims. In particular, the following passages lack or have vague antecedent basis:

(i) "the patient": claim 9, line 2

claim 11, line 2

(ii) "the service provider": claim 41, line 8

claim 43, line 2

(iii) Claims 42 and 44-45 incorporate the deficiencies of claim 41, through dependency, and are also rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

6. Claim 40 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Under the statute, the claimed invention must fall into

one of the four recognized statutory classes of invention, namely, a process (or method); a machine (or system); an article of manufacture; or a composition of matter.

Claim 40 appears to be directed toward a business model. However, it is unclear as to which recognized statutory class of invention the "business model" of claim 40 is directed. In particular, a "business model" is not a process or method, as it lacks a series of steps. A "business model" is not a machine or system, as there is no specific recitation of machine or system components. A "business model" is not recognized as a composition of matter. A "business model" per se is merely a description of the operations of a business. Since these descriptions are typically fixed in some tangible medium (e.g., paper), a possible category for a "model" may be "article of manufacture". However, if the claimed business model fails to qualify as an "article of manufacture", the business model is merely a collection of data, which is not suitable for patent protection under 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

8. Claims 1-11, 17, 30-31, 34-47, 51-55, and 57-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Segal et al. (US 200110041991 A1).

(A) Referring to claim 1, Segal discloses a broad-band, computer-based networked system comprising (Fig. 1 and para. 11 of Segal):

an encrypted collection of electronic medical records of a plurality of persons wherein (para. 137, lines 3-6 of Segal):

the medical records are obtained and electronically compiled from a plurality of sources (para. 13 of Segal; the Examiner interprets "physician offices and facilities such as hospitals" to be a form of "sources");

the medical record of a person is transmissible in whole or in part only to that person and others authorized by that person (para. 15 and para. 27 of Segal);

each medical record can be supplemented with additional information (para. 6 of Segal; the Examiner interprets "appended and updated" to be a form of "supplemented");

and additional medical records for additional persons may be added to the collection (para. 74 and para. 26 of Segal; the Examiner interprets "registers" to be a form of "added" and "plurality of patients" to be a form of "persons");

a secure access for allowing each person to access only their own medical record (para. 26 of Segal); and

another secure access for allowing said others authorized to access only that person's medical records (para. 28, lines 1-6 of Segal).

(B) Referring to claim 2, Segal discloses wherein said medical records are electronically complied by direct input or digital scanning of written information into a computer-readable format (para. 23 of Segal).

(C) Referring to claim 3, Segal discloses wherein the sources are selected from the group consisting of hospitals, clinics, physician's offices, pharmacies and combinations thereof (para. 13 of Segal).

(D) Referring to claim 4, Segal discloses wherein said medical records are transmissible through the Internet (para. 21 of Segal).

(E) Referring to claim 5, Segal discloses wherein the medical record for each person contains one or more of: a table of contents an index, a source notation for information contained within the medical record, an electronic search tool, annotations for errors, linked annotations for errors, treatment options, health care choices, verification standards and news items relevant to the information in the medical record (para. 138 of Segal).

(F) Referring to claim 6, Segal discloses wherein the secure access and the another secure access comprise passwords or encryption keys (para. 103 of Segal).

(G) Referring to claim 7, Segal discloses wherein the others authorized are selected from the group consisting of physicians, nurses, hospitals and health care institutions (para. 27, lines 1-10 of Segal).

(H) Referring to claim 8, Segal discloses wherein one or more medical record possesses the characteristic of non-repudiation (para. 8 and para. 131 of Segal).

Art Unit: 3626

(I) Referring to claim 9, Segal discloses wherein said non-repudiated medical record is primary for treatment of the patient to whom said non-repudiated medical record pertains (para. 5 of Segal).

(J) Referring to claim 10, Segal discloses wherein each medical record is certified as accurate (para. 8 of Segal).

(K) Referring to claim 11, Segal discloses wherein each certified medical record is certified as accurate by the patient, by the source from which said each medical record was obtained, by a system provider or by a combination thereof (para. 131 of Segal).

(L) Referring to claim 17, Segal discloses a fee which is assessed for maintenance of a medical record (para. 103 of Segal).

(M) Referring to claim 30, Segal discloses a method for creating an accessible electronic medical records database comprising (see abstract of Segal):

obtaining and compiling a medical record pertaining to a patient (para. 13 of Segal);

electronically inputting said medical record obtained into a secure computer database containing other medical records (para. 23, para. 36, and para. 137 of Segal); and

allowing said patient and those authorized by said patient access to said patient's medical record wherein access to all other medical records is blocked (para. 28, lines 1-6 of Segal).

(N) Referring to claim 31, Segal discloses wherein the medical record is obtained from a plurality of sources (para. 13 of Segal).

(O) Referring to claim 34, Segal discloses updating the medical record database with additional medical information pertaining to said patient (para. 6 of Segal).

(P) Referring to claim 35, Segal discloses securely transmitting all or part of said patient's medical record to a third party as designated by said patient (para. 15 of Segal, the Examiner interprets "distribution" to be a form of "transmitting")

(Q) Referring to claim 36, Segal discloses displaying said medical record pertaining to a patient (para. 23 of Segal).

(R) Referring to claim 37, Segal discloses an electronic database of medical records created and compiled (para. 21 and para. 22 of Segal).

(S) Referring to claim 38, Segal discloses a database which contains the entire medical history of at least one person (para. 13 and para. 5 of Segal; the Examiner interprets "complete" to be a form of "entire").

(T) Referring to claim 39, Segal discloses wherein each medical record is remotely accessible in whole or in part only by the patient to whom the medical record pertains and those authorized by said patient (para. 23, para. 26, and para. 28, lines 1-6 of Segal).

(U) Referring to claim 40, Segal discloses a business model comprising a secure database of medical records obtained from a plurality of sources whereby each medical record is accessible through transmission pathways and only by the person to whom the

medical record pertains and those authorized by said person (para. 137, lines 1-6, para. 13, para. 15, and para. 27 of Segal).

(V) Referring to claim 41, Segal discloses a method for integrating medical records to create a certified medical record database comprising (para. 8 and para. 131 of Segal; the Examiner interprets "quality assurance" to be a form of "certified"):

obtaining medical information from one or more healthcare sources for a plurality of patients (para. 13 of Segal);

electronically inputting all of the medical information obtained into a secure computer database to create medical records (para. 23 of Segal); and

certifying that each of said medical records meet one of a plurality of certification standards established by the service provider to create the certified medical record database (para. 131 of Segal).

(W) Referring to claim 42, Segal discloses wherein any one of the certified medical records can be transmitted only to the patient to whom the record pertains or those authorized by said patient (para. 28, lines 1-6 of Segal).

(X) Referring to claim 43, Segal discloses wherein the plurality of certification standards are selected from the group consisting of self-certification, certification by the service provider and combinations thereof (para. 131 of Segal).

(Y) Referring to claim 44, Segal discloses a step whereby said patient obtains an analysis of the medical record (para. 23 of Segal).

(Z) Referring to claim 45, Segal discloses providing said certified medical record database with the characteristic of non-repudiation (para. 8 and para. 131 of Segal).

(AA) Referring to claim 46, Segal discloses a computer system for management of medical records comprising (see abstract of Segal):

a database of medical records pertaining to one or more subjects (para. 23 and Fig. 1, item 110 of Segal);

receiving means for receiving information pertaining to said medical records from one or more senders (para. 13 of Segal);

transmission means for transmitting a portion of said medical records to one or more receivers (para. 20 of Segal); and

authorization means for authorizing said senders and receivers according to a set of rules, wherein said set of rules is designated by said subjects (para. 81 of Segal).

(BB) Referring to claim 47, Segal discloses wherein said database is a secure database (para. 84 of Segal).

(CC) Referring to claim 51, Segal discloses wherein said receiving means is selected from the group consisting of: modem, cellular receiver, infrared receiver, Ethernet card, facsimile, cable modem, satellite receiver, optical, analog receiver, Internet hub, and web-server (para. 85 of Segal).

(DD) Referring to claim 52, Segal discloses wherein said transmission means is selected from the group consisting of: modem, cellular transmitter, infrared transmitter, Ethernet card, facsimile, cable modem, satellite transmitter, analog transmitter, Internet hub, and web-server (para. 85 of Segal).

(EE) Referring to claim 53, Segal discloses wherein said authorization means comprises public key encryption, digital signatures, biometrics, certificate authorities, or user passwords (para. 103 of Segal).

(FF) Referring to claim 54, Segal discloses wherein said portion of said medical records have the characteristic of non-repudiation (para. 8 and para. 131 of Segal).

(GG) Referring to claim 55, Segal discloses wherein said non-repudiated medical records are primary for treatment of said subjects (para. 5 of Segal).

(HH) Referring to claim 57, Segal discloses wherein said database is administered by a service provider other than said subjects, senders, and receivers (Fig. 1, item 102, para. 60, and para. 74 of Segal).

(II) Referring to claim 58, Segal discloses vetting means, wherein said vetting means allows said subjects to supplement said medical records with information relating to the accuracy of said medical records (para. 6 and para. 25 of Segal).

(JJ) Referring to claim 59, Segal discloses wherein said medical records are owned by said subjects (para. 14 of Segal).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(x) as being unpatentable over Segal et al. (US 2001/0041991 A1) in view of Baker ("PCASSO: A Model for Safe Use of the Internet in Healthcare").

(A) Referring to claim 12, Segal does not disclose wherein the collection comprises medical records of more than 100,000 persons.

Baker discloses wherein the collection comprises medical records of more than 100,000 persons (col. 3, lines 1-4 of Baker).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the feature of Baker within Segal. The motivation for doing so would have been to accommodate as large a customer base as possible.

11. Claims 13-15, 20-22, 25-29, 32-33, and 48-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Segal et al. (US 2001/0041991 A1) in view of Malik (US 2001/0037219 A1).

(A) Referring to claims 13-15, Segal does not disclose wherein said collection complies with a federal or state standard of privacy and security, wherein the federal standard is the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996, and wherein said collection complies with all state standards of privacy and security for the geographical area in which the system operates.

Malik discloses wherein said collection complies with a federal or state standard of privacy and security, wherein the federal standard is the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996, and wherein said

Art Unit: 3626

collection complies with all state standards of privacy and security for the geographical area in which the system operates (para. 40 and para. 59 of Malik).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the features of Malik within Segal. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow for communication in a secure environment (para. 40) and to be aware of the laws and regulations governing health care in each jurisdiction (para. 59 of Malik).

(B) Referring to claim 20, Segal discloses a broad-band, computer-based networked system for individual control and management of electronic medical records comprising a plurality of medical records representing a plurality of persons (Fig. 1, para. 11, and para. 14 of Segal)

Segal does not disclose that the system complies with a federal standard of privacy and security.

Malik discloses that the system complies with a federal standard of privacy and security (para. 40 of Malik).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the feature of Malik within Segal. The motivation for doing so would have been to be aware of the laws and regulations (para. 59 of Malik).

(C) Referring to claim 21, Segal discloses a system that allows for certification of said medical records (para. 131 of Segal; the Examiner interprets "performs quality assurance" to be a form of "certification").

(D) Referring to claim 22, Segal discloses wherein certification represents a predetermined degree of completeness, accuracy or both to said medical records (para. 131 of Segal).

(E) Referring to claim 25, Segal discloses a system which allows for non-repudiation of said medical records (para. 8 and para. 131 of Segal).

(F) Referring to claim 26, Segal discloses wherein non-repudiated medical records are primary for treatment of the person to whom each medical record pertains (para. 5 of Segal).

(G) Referring to claims 27-28, Segal does not disclose wherein the federal standard is the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 and which further complies with a state standard of privacy and security.

Malik discloses wherein the federal standard is the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 and which further complies with a state standard of privacy and security (para. 40 and para. 59 of Malik).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the features of Malik within Segal. The motivation for doing so would have been to incorporate laws and regulations into the system (para. 59 of Malik).

(H) Referring to claim 29, Segal discloses wherein access to any one medical record is restricted to the person to whom said one medical record pertains or to others designated and authorized by said person (para. 26 and para. 28, lines 1-6 of Segal).

(I) Referring to claims 32 and 33, Segal does not disclose wherein access to the electronic medical record database complies with a federal standard of privacy and

security and wherein the federal standard is the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996.

Malik discloses wherein access to the electronic medical record database complies with a federal standard of privacy and security and wherein the federal standard is the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (para. 40 of Malik).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the features of Malik within Segal. The motivation for doing so would have been to incorporate laws and regulations into the system (para. 59 of Malik).

(J) Referring to claims 48-50, Segal does not disclose wherein said secure database complies with a federal standard of privacy and security, wherein the federal standard is the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996, and which further complies with a state standard of privacy and security.

Malik discloses wherein said secure database complies with a federal standard of privacy and security, wherein the federal standard is the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996, and which further complies with a state standard of privacy and security (para. 40 and para. 59 of Malik).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the features of Malik within Segal. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow for communication in a secure environment (para. 40) and to be aware of the laws and regulations governing health care in each jurisdiction (para. 59 of Malik).

12. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Segal et al. (US 2001/0041991 A1) in view of Shear (4,827,508).

(A) Referring to claim 16, Segal does not disclose a fee which is assessed for each access to a medical record.

Shear discloses a fee which is assessed for each access to a medical record (col. 3, lines 3-14 of Shear).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the feature of Shear within Segal. The motivation for doing so would have been to charge a fee in accordance with the amount the user has used the system (col. 3, lines 11-14 of Shear).

13. Claims 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Segal et al. (US 2001/0041991 A1) in view of Ertel (5,307,262).

(A) Referring to claims 18 & 19, Segal does not disclose wherein each medical record is vetted and wherein the vetted medical record contains one or more of: corrections of incorrect information, notations of incorrect information, notations of anomalies, linking of errors, linking of anomalies, notation of discrepancies, linking of discrepancies, and combinations thereof.

Ertel discloses wherein each medical record is vetted and wherein the vetted medical record contains one or more of: corrections of incorrect information, notations of incorrect information, notations of anomalies, linking of errors, linking of anomalies,

notation of discrepancies, linking of discrepancies, and combinations thereof (col. 9, lines 1-9 and col. 10, lines 30-37 of Ertel).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the features of Ertel within Segal. The motivation for doing so would have been to prevent erroneous data from being included in the record (col. 9, lines 4-9 of Ertel).

14. Claims 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Segal et al. (US 2001/0041991 A1) in view of Malik (US 2001/0037219 A1) as applied to claim 20 above, and further in view of Ertel (5,307,262).

(A) Referring to claims 23 & 24, Segal and Malik do not disclose a system which allows for vetting of said medical records and wherein vetted medical records have been reviewed and corrected or annotated for errors, discrepancies and anomalies.

Ertel discloses a system which allows for vetting of said medical records and wherein vetted medical records have been reviewed and corrected or annotated for errors, discrepancies and anomalies (col. 9, lines 1-9 and col. 10, lines 30-37 of Ertel).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the features of Ertel within Segal and Malik. The motivation for doing so would have been to prevent erroneous data from being included in the record (col. 9, lines 4-9 of Ertel).

15. Claim 56 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Segal et al. (US 2001/0041991 A1) in view of Joao (US 6,283,761 B1).

(A) Referring to claim 56, Segal discloses an integration means for reception, display, analysis and modification of said medical records available to be performed on a plurality of systems of various health care providers, payors, and other users (para. 23, para. 6, and para. 10 of Segal).

Segal does not disclose clearinghouses and oversight agencies.

Joao discloses clearinghouses and oversight agencies (col. 4, line 59 – col. 5, line 6 and col. 27, line 58 – col. 28, line 3 of Joao).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the features of Joao within Segal. The motivation for doing so would have been to facilitate the offering, selling, buying, and/or other transactions involving healthcare-related services (col. 5, lines 1-5 of Joao).

Conclusion

16. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The cited but not applied prior art teaches a dynamic remotely accessible medical record (US 2001/0032100 A1); a method and apparatus for requesting, retrieving, and normalizing medical information (US 2001/0053986 A1); and a system, method and article of manufacture for managing a medical services network (US 2001/0051881 A1).

Art Unit: 3626

17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lena Najarian whose telephone number is 571-272-7072. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Thomas can be reached on 571-272-6776. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ln

In

6-10-05



ALEXANDER KALINOWSKI
PRIMARY EXAMINER